

NOTE: The Government's response to Industry's Question 14 has been revised.

Question 14: Will the awardee or any down selected candidate awardee receive a pre-award audit?

Response 14: A pre-award is not anticipated.

Question 21: As the work is anticipated to be performed on-site, can you please explain the necessity for the contractor to provide a Safety and Health Plan? Our expectation is that employees would have to follow NASA's established guidelines as would any contractor developed plan.

Response 21: Per NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Provision 1823.7001(a), Clause 1852.223-70, is required to be included in all solicitations and contracts when the work will be conducted completely or partly on premises owned or controlled by the Government.

Questions 22: As the work is anticipated to be performed on-site, can you please explain the necessity for the contractor to provide an IT Plan? Our expectation is that employees would have to follow NASA's established guidelines as would any contractor developed plan.

Response 22: Per NFS Provision 1804.470-4(a), Clause 1852.204-76, is required in all solicitations when contract performance requires contractors to have physical or electronic access to NASA's computer systems, networks, or IT infrastructure or use information systems to generate, store or exchange data with NASA or on behalf of NASA, regardless of whether the data resides on a NASA or a contractor's information system.

Question 23: It would appear that many of the requirements are exclusionary (\$2.5 mil annual receipts project requirement, subcontractor cost proposals, safety and IT plans, inspection system). Can the government please explain the drivers and necessity behind these requirements?

Response 23: The Safety, IT plans and inspection requirements are not meant to be exclusionary as they are required by the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) and/or NFS. Responses 21 and 22 address Safety and IT Plans, and FAR Provision 46.305 requires the inclusion of Clause 52.246-5 in Cost Reimbursement contract for services, which addresses inspection system. In terms of the past performance evaluation (i.e., annual receipts), the value was revised from \$2.5 to \$1M and sections L.22.A and M.6, were updated accordingly.

Question 24: Requires experience specifically with FPPS, can we substitute experience with another government used HRIS?

Response 24: Specific experience with Federal Personnel Processing System (FPPS) is not mandatory; however, knowledge and experience with the use of systems such as FPPS is necessary to perform this effort.

Question 25: Can some of the work be performed off site at the contractor's location?

Response 25: All work under this procurement is expected to be performed on-site.

Question 26: For the purposes of the Cost Volume, a significant subcontractor is defined as a subcontractor expected to exceed 20% of a proposed Representative Task Order (RTO) estimate. A proposed significant subcontractor shall provide the same cost exhibits and supporting information that is requested from the prime Offeror.(2) Offerors and proposed significant subcontractors for cost proposal purposes defined as any subcontract that is likely to exceed 20% of a proposed Representative Task Order (RTO) estimate shall forward one (1) additional copy of their Cost Proposal, marked —NNG12418706R/NASA Proposal Evaluation Material|| , to their cognizant Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) office by the proposal due date specified in the Standard Form 33, Block 9. A copy of the proposal transmittal letter to DCAA shall be forwarded to the Contracting Officer for each cost proposal (prime and significant subcontractors) responding to this RFP. It is an difficult requirement to request separate pricing volumes with DCAA accounting approved for small businesses. If the significant contractor is also a small business can this requirement be waived?

Response 26: This requirement was revised in the Final RFP. At Section L.18, the significant subcontractor is defined as a subcontractor expected to exceed 40% of the proposed RTOs cumulative estimate.

Question 27: The government states "Offerors shall propose the total firm-fixed-price associated with the 30-day phase-in period, which will be performed under a separate, firm-fixed-price order. Exhibit 10 shall be used to state the proposed price for the phase-in, which is expected to commence on or about TBD." Can you provide the anticipated LOE for the first task in order for contractors to calculate the price?

Response 27: The RFP requires Offerors to provide a detailed phase-in plan that addresses, at a minimum, the Offeror's approach to phase-in sufficient to ensure continuity and smooth transition with the incumbent Contractor up to a 30-day phase-in period. The anticipated "LOE" for the first task(s) are not available and will be dependent on each Offeror's unique approach to meeting the OHCM requirements.

Question 28: The government states "Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for all of your most recent contracts (completed and ongoing) for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$2.5M that your company has had within the last 5 years of the RFP release date". As there are few pure HR contracts for small businesses that provide annual receipts of \$2.5 mil (i.e., there are technology, admin, etc contracts that provide this level, but not HR), it would appear that the government would prefer to work with a technology or admin firm versus a pure human capital firm. Would the government consider relaxing this requirement to perhaps \$1 mil annual cost/fee?

Response 28: The Government has revised the appropriate sections in the final RFP. In regards to the Past Performance requirement, for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred, the amount was changed to read from \$2.5M to \$1M in Sections L.22.A and M.6.

Question 29: The government states “Prime Offerers shall furnish the information requested below for all of your most recent contracts...for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$2.5 mil...” Can this requirement be met by a sub?

Response 29: No, this requirement must be met by the Prime. Also see response to question 28, where the Prime past performance was reduced from \$2.5M to \$1.0M.

Question 30: The government states “For the purposes of the Past Performance Volume, a proposed significant subcontractor is defined as any proposed subcontractor that is estimated to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee of \$500K. The offeror shall provide the information requested below for any significant subcontractor(s) for those similar efforts within the last 5 years of the RFP release date with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of at least 10% of the estimated average annual dollar value of the proposed significant subcontract.” This requirement appears to limit the competition to only very large 8a firms. Is that the government’s intention? Would the government consider eliminating this requirement?

Response 30: It is not the Governments intent to limit the competition; however, the Government requires the information in order to properly conduct its past performance evaluation. Also see response to question 28, where we the Prime past performance was reduced from \$2.5M to \$1.0M.

Question 31: Reference L.22, DRFP pages 90-93: Will the Government allow offerors to cite classified programs for past performance? If so, please provide appropriate instructions for submittal of classified past performance citations

Response 31: Past performance on classified programs should not be submitted. Members of the evaluation team don’t have required clearances to review that classified information.

Question 32: Section L.20.1, p. 80, indicates that Offerors must identify and discuss risk factors and discuss their approach to manage the risks. Within Section M, it appears that the only evaluation factors involving risk appear in M.3. Subfactor A - Representative Task Orders, as they relate to showing full understanding of risks and possible problem mitigation/resolution. Please clarify how the Government will evaluate the offeror's ability to identify risks and the offeror's approach to managing such risks.

(Similar Question): Reference Paragraph L.20.1: This paragraph requires offerors to address risk factors associated with accomplishment of the –contemplated contract. Several of the areas of possible risk that are identified relate to items addressed in Subfactor B, Management Plan, but we can find no corresponding language in the evaluation factors for the Management Plan that address risk factors. Please clarify how risk factors associated with the Management Plan will be evaluated.

Response 32: The following paragraph was added to Section M.4. The Government will evaluate the appropriateness of the Offeror's identification of the significant risks under this contract. The risk management techniques will be evaluated for their ability to effectively mitigate risks.

Question 33: Section L.22 (a), Page 90: Prime Offerors shall furnish the information requested below for all of your most recent contracts (completed and ongoing) for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred of \$2.5M that your company has had within the last 5 years of the RFP release date. Can this \$2.5M requirement be eliminated or substantially reduced?

Response 33: The Government has revised the appropriate sections in the final RFP. In regards to the Past Performance requirement, for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred, the amount was changed from \$2.5M to \$1M in Sections L.22.A and M.6.

Question 34: Section L.22 (a) Page 90: ... most related (i.e. similar in size and content) and how they are related to the proposed effort, as well as which contracts were performed by the division of your company (if applicable) that will perform the proposed contract/subcontract. Can (i.e. similar in size and content) be revised to (i.e. similar in content/tasks)

Response 34: Your request cannot be accommodated. Relevance of a past or current contract is evaluated for size and content to include complexity within content; therefore, size cannot be eliminated from the past performance evaluation.

Question 35: Section M.5 Page 103: For a prime contractor's contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally relevant, it must meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee incurred of at least \$2.5M. Relevance of a past or current contract is evaluated for size and content to include complexity with content. Can this \$2.5M requirement be eliminated or substantially reduced?

Response 35: The Government has revised the appropriate sections in the final RFP. In regards to the Past Performance requirement, for similar efforts with a minimum average annual cost/fee incurred, the amount was changed from \$2.5M to \$1M. See section L.22.A and M.6.

Question 36: Section L.21 .2 (a), Page 85-86: The labor rates included as Enclosure 18, sample Direct Labor Rates and incumbent Position Descriptions, Positions and Descriptions, reflects the unburdened hourly rates for the labor categories currently being used under the incumbent contract. If the offeror proposes to capture incumbent personnel as part of its overall staffing approach, then Offerors shall use these rates as a guide in proposing unloaded direct labor rates. Any proposed variances from these incumbent rates shall be fully explained and justified. Will the Government modify Enclosure 18 and provide labor rates as described since they are not

currently included in Enclosure 18? If so, what is the effective date of the incumbent labor rates and will the Government update the rates in the final RFP to make them current using incumbent provided escalation anniversary dates and NASA recommended escalation factors??

Response 36: The final RFP has been updated to remove the reference “labor rates” from Enclosure 18.

Question 37: Section M.2 (a), page

The standards and procedures for determining whether prospective contractors and subcontractors are responsible are set forth in FAR Subpart 9.1. Deficiencies concerning the general standards of prospective contractor responsibility at FAR 9.104-1, and any special standards established for this procurement under FAR 9.104-2, may be serious enough to result in a determination of non-responsibility. As with all aspects of prospective contractor responsibility, a finding of non-responsibility can be made at any time prior to contract award. However, even if such deficiencies are not so serious to result in such a determination, they will nonetheless be considered in the evaluation as conducted under the evaluation factors set forth in this solicitation. Can the Government identify which FAR 9.104-1 provisions are applicable to this acquisition as described below?

To be determined responsible, a prospective contractor must-

- (a) Have adequate financial resources to perform the contract, or the ability to obtain them (see 9.104-3(a));
- (b) Be able to comply with the required or proposed delivery or performance schedule, taking into consideration all existing commercial and governmental business commitments;
- (c) Have a satisfactory performance record (see 9.104-3(b) and Subpart 42.15). A prospective contractor shall not be determined responsible or nonresponsible solely on the basis of a lack of relevant performance history, except as provided in 9.104-2;
- (d) Have a satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics (for example, see Subpart 42.15).
- (e) Have the necessary organization, experience, accounting and operational controls, and technical skills, or the ability to obtain them (including, as appropriate, such elements as production control procedures, property control systems, quality assurance measures, and safety programs applicable to materials to be produced or services to be performed by the prospective contractor and subcontractors). (See 9.104-3(a).)
- (f) Have the necessary production, construction, and technical equipment and facilities, or the ability to obtain them (see 9.104-3(a)); and
- (g) Be otherwise qualified and eligible to receive an award under applicable laws and regulations (see also inverted domestic corporation prohibition at 9.108).

Response 37: All FAR 9.104-1 provisions are applicable to this acquisition.